

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 7, 9, 10, 16 and 18-20 have been amended herewith. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Amendments were made to the specification to correct errors and to clarify the specification. No new matter has been added by any of the amendments to the specification.

I. Specification Objection

The Examiner objected to the Specification, stating that the current status of all cited documents must be provided. In response thereto, Applicants are amending the Specification herewith to include the current status information for these cited documents.

The Examiner also notes a problem with one of the serial numbers previously provided for these cited documents. Applicants note that the serial number is correct as is – it was the internal attorney docket number which was wrong (and which has previously been cancelled from the Specification).

Therefore, the objection of the Specification has been overcome.

II. Information Disclosure Statements

The Examiner requests that Applicant point which references submitted in the provided Information Disclosure Statements are pertinent or relevant to the patentability of the invention as claimed in the present application.

Applicants aver that the references submitted in the Information Disclosure Statements are with respect to art cited in the related application identified on page 1 of the present application, and was therefore provided in order to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.56. This information is fully compliant with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.98.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner rejected Claims 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed towards non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner suggested certain changes be made to Claims 17 and 18, and Applicants have amended such claims accordingly. Therefore, the rejection of Claims 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 has been overcome.

IV. 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-7, 9-16 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed as follows.

The Examiner states that the amount of polling packets which constitutes an excessive amount is indefinite. Applicants have amended all claims to eliminate this objectionable language, and urge that the claims as amended are definite.

Therefore the rejection of Claims 1-7, 9-16 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph has been overcome.

V. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: 6/15/05

Respectfully submitted,



Cathrine K. Kinslow
Reg. No. 51,886
Wayne P. Bailey
Reg. No. 34,289
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorneys for Applicants